

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

THE WEISER LAW FIRM, P.C., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MICHAEL HARTLEIB,

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 19-2728-KSM

ORDER

AND NOW, this 31st day of March, 2020, upon consideration of Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) (Doc. No. 72) and Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint (Doc. No. 73), it is **ORDERED** that the Motion is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**. It is **FUTHER ORDERED** as follows:

1. Defendant's motion is **DENIED** as to the defamation claim to the extent it is based on Statements No. 9 and 11. Defendant's motion is **GRANTED** as to the defamation claim to the extent it is based on Statements No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17.

2. Defendant's motion is **DENIED** as to the intentional infliction of emotional distress claim.

3. Defendant's motion is **DENIED** as to the commercial disparagement claim to the extent it is based on Statements No. 9 and 11. Defendant's motion is **GRANTED** as to the commercial disparagement claim to the extent it is based on Statements No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17.

4. Defendant's motion is **DENIED** as to the false light claim to the extent it is based

on Statements No. 9 and 11. Defendant's motion is **GRANTED** as to the false light claim to the extent it is based on Statements No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Karen Spencer Marston

KAREN SPENCER MARSTON, J.